

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO INITIAL STUDY SUMMARY - ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

(ver 2.1)

Project Title & No. ALUP Amendment for the Oceano Airport ED06-300

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The proposed project could have a "Potentially Significant Impact" for at least one of the environmental factors checked below. Please refer to the attached pages for discussion on mitigation measures or project revisions to either reduce these impacts to less than significant levels or require further study.						
Aes Agri Air (thetics icultural Resources Quality ogical Resources cural Resources	Geology and Soils Hazards/Hazardous Noise Population/Housing Public Services/Utilit	Materials Recreation Transportation Wastewater Water	/Circulation		
DETER	RMINATION: (To be com	pleted by the Lead Agend	cy)			
On the	basis of this initial evalu	ation, the Environmental (Coordinator finds that:			
	The proposed project NEGATIVE DECLARAT		gnificant effect on the enviro	nment, and a		
	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.					
		MAY have a signific ACT REPORT is required	cant effect on the environn d.	nent, and an		
	unless mitigated" impact analyzed in an earlier addressed by mitigation	ct on the environment, but document pursuant to a n measures based on th IENTAL IMPACT REPOR	significant impact" or "potention at least one effect 1) has be pplicable legal standards, and e earlier analysis as describe RT is required, but it must an	en adequately d 2) has been d on attached		
	Although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.					
	Robeson	Olama a Arma		April 4, 2007		
Prepar	ed by (Print)	Signature		Date		
loh	ın Nall		Ellen Carroll, Environmental Coordinator	April 5,2007		
	ved by (Print)	Signature	(for)	Date		

Project Environmental Analysis

The County's environmental review process incorporates all of the requirements for completing the Initial Study as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The Initial Study includes staff's on-site inspection of the project site and surroundings and a detailed review of the information in the file for the project. In addition, available background information is reviewed for each project. Relevant information regarding soil types and characteristics, geologic information, significant vegetation and/or wildlife resources, water availability, wastewater disposal services, existing land uses and surrounding land use categories and other information relevant to the environmental review process are evaluated for each project. Exhibit A includes the references used, as well as the agencies or groups that were contacted as a part of the Initial Study. The Environmental Division uses the checklist to summarize the results of the research accomplished during the initial environmental review of the project.

Persons, agencies or organizations interested in obtaining more information regarding the environmental review process for a project should contact the County of San Luis Obispo Environmental Division, Rm. 200, County Government Center, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93408-2040 or call (805) 781-5600.

A. PROJECT

DESCRIPTION: The proposed project is an Amendment to the Airport Land Use Plan for the Oceano County Airport.

The Public Utilities Code of the State of California requires that each county within the state that contains a public use airport establish an Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC). The ALUC is responsible for formulating and maintaining land use plans for airports within the county, as well as reviewing local agency actions and airport master plans. Under state law, the purposes of the Airport Land Use Plan (or "comprehensive land use plan") are:

- To "provide for the orderly growth of each public airport and the area surrounding the airport within the jurisdiction of the commission", and
- To "safeguard the general welfare of the inhabitants within the vicinity of the airport and the public in general."

To assist local Airport Land Use Commissions in the preparation and adoption of Airport Land Use Plans, the Division of Aeronautics of the State of California Department of Transportation authors and distributes an advisory publication known as the *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. The most recent edition of this publication was released in January, 2002.

In accordance with the requirements of the Public Utilities Code, the Airport Land Use Commission of San Luis Obispo County, in 1976, prepared and adopted an Airport Land Use Plan (ALUP) for the Oceano County Airport. The ALUP has remained unchanged from its adoption to the present. One of the main purposes of this amendment is to bring the local ALUP into compliance with State standards, as setforth in the *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. Significant changes included:

- The authority and purpose of the ALUC were specifically defined
- The area of geographic coverage of the ALUP was specifically defined
- Local jurisdictions affected by the ALUP were identified
- Limitations of the ALUP were delineated in accord with State statute
- Policies related to aviation safety hazards, noise impacts, airspace protection, and overflight protection were set forth

- The types of actions taken by local governments which require review by the ALUC were specifically identified
- The information required by the ALUC for review of a local action was identified
- State-mandated time limitations on ALUC review of local actions were incorporated
- The choices of action available to the ALUC were enumerated
- The right of the ALUC to make all determinations concerning compatibility of local actions with the adopted ALUC was reserved, as provided by the Public Utilities Code

In addition, this proposed Amendment adapts the ALUP to the specific needs of the Paso Robles area, while maintaining the purposes, intent, and structure required by the *Airport Land Use Planning Handbook*. The goals of this project and substantial changes enacted by this Amendment include:

• GOAL: To provide local agencies with a greater degree of flexibility in planning for development within the Airport Planning Area, while adequately minimizing exposure of persons on the ground to excessive aviation-related noise impacts.

The Airport Land Use Plan currently in force prohibits all noise-sensitive development (with the exception of infill) within the projected 55-dB CNEL airport noise contour. The current Amendment would modify this policy by:

- Development of a the list of land uses designated as "noise-sensitive"
- Permitting development of noise sensitive land uses in the area between the projected 55dB and 60-dB CNEL airport noise contours, so long as adequate noise mitigation is provided. The degree of noise mitigation required is specified and is based on airport singleevent noise contours.
- GOAL: Improve usability of the ALUP for members of the general public and incorporate Airport Land Use Planning Handbook Policies (appropriate for the Oceano County Airport).

The current Amendment would simplify this situation:

- The Airport Land Use Planning Zone Map has been modified to reflect current uses and zoning that surround the airport.
- The Airport Land Use Compatibility Matrix has been modified to reflect the proposed ALUP Policies
- Development of Special Function land Uses (Nursing Homes schools etc.) which are certain types of land uses that require special protection from aviation hazards

The Airport Land Use Compatibility Matrix has also been expanded, so that less interpretation will be required on the part of the ALUP, and has been reformatted to more closely resemble the allowable land use tables in County planning documents.

Additional modifications to improve usability of the ALUP include:

 Additional tables and figures are provided, eliminating much of the need for calculation of allowable residential and non-residential density levels.

Persons or agencies who desire more detailed information concerning the provisions of the proposed ALUP Amendment are invited to review the Proposed Amendment to the Airport Land Use Plan for the Oceano County Airport, January 17, 2006, the text and figures of which are incorporated into this description by reference. This document may be obtained from The County of San Luis Obispo Department of Planning and Building, County Government Center, 1050 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93408.

This Amendment was prepared in accordance with Sections 21674.7 and Section 21675(a) of the Public Utilities Code of the State of California.

ASSESSOR PARCEL NUMBER(S): Airport Review area SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT # 4

B. EXISTING SETTING

PLANNING AREA: San Luis Bay Inland and Coastal

LAND USE CATEGORY: All

COMBINING DESIGNATION(S): None

EXISTING USES: Commercial use, accessory structures, agricultural uses, residential uses

TOPOGRAPHY: Nearly level to moderately sloping

VEGETATION: Grasses, coatal dune scrub, scattered oaks

PARCEL SIZE: Not applicable

SURROUNDING LAND USE CATEGORIES AND USES:

North: Commercial Retail; commercial use Residential Multi Family	East: Residential Multi-Family; residential
South: Agriculture; Industrial, industrial uses agricultural uses	West: Residential Multi-Family; commercial use, residential use

C. ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

During the Initial Study process, no issues were identified as having potentially significant environmental effects (see following Initial Study).

COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

1.	AESTHETICS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Create an aesthetically incompatible site open to public view?				

1.	AESTHETICS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable		
b)	Introduce a use within a scenic view open to public view?						
c)	Change the visual character of an area?						
d)	Create glare or night lighting, which may affect surrounding areas?						
e)	Impact unique geological or physical features?						
f)	Other:				\boxtimes		
Impa the A requi has r	do not silhouette against ridgelines as viewed from public roadways. The proposed amendment project does not contain any development requirements. Impact. No significant visual impacts associated with the proposed amendment will occur, because the Airport Land Use Plan and the proposed Amendment thereto do not, either directly or indirectly, require or encourage any development within or outside of to the Airport Planning Area, this project has no impact on visual resources within the Airport Planning Area. Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.						
2. /	AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable		
a)	Convert prime agricultural land to non-agricultural use?						
b)	Impair agricultural use of other property or result in conversion to other uses?						

Setting. There are numerous soil types encountered in the areas surrounding the airport, however since the proposed amendment project does not contain any development requirements, it is not necessary to list soil types.

_Impact. Since no development will occur as a result of the proposed amendment to the ALUP, no significant impacts to agricultural resources will occur.

Conflict with existing zoning or

Williamson Act program?

Other: _____

c)

d)

X

Mitigation/Conclusion. No mitigation measures are necessary.

3.	AIR QUALITY - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable	
a)	Violate any state or federal ambient air quality standard, or exceed air quality emission thresholds as established by County Air Pollution Control District?					
b)	Expose any sensitive receptor to substantial air pollutant concentrations?					
c)	Create or subject individuals to objectionable odors?					
d)	Be inconsistent with the District's Clean Air Plan?					
e)	Other:					
Handbook to evaluate project specific impacts and help determine if air quality mitigation measures are needed, or if potentially significant impacts could result. To evaluate long-term emissions, cumulative effects, and establish countywide programs to reach acceptable air quality levels, a Clean Air Plan has been adopted (prepared by APCD). Impact. As proposed, the project will not require the disturbance of any property. There will be no creation of construction dust, or short- and long-term vehicle emissions. Based on Table 1-1 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, the project will result in less than 10 lbs./day of pollutants, which is below thresholds warranting any mitigation. The project is consistent with the general level of development anticipated and projected in the Clean Air Plan. No significant air quality impacts are expected to occur.						
9	ation/Conclusion. No mitigation measure		y.			
4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable	
a)	Result in a loss of unique or special status species or their habitats?					
b)	Reduce the extent, diversity or quality of native or other important vegetation?					

4.	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
c)	Impact wetland or riparian habitat?				
d)	Introduce barriers to movement of resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or factors, which could hinder the normal activities of wildlife?				
e)	Other:				
	ng. Numerous habitats were observed of lopment is associated with the proposed an				
	act. The proposed amendment does not rect on sensitive native vegetation, significan				
_	gation/Conclusion. No significant biologic ssary.	al impacts wil	l occur, and n	o mitigation me	easures are
5.	CULTURAL RESOURCES - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Disturb pre-historic resources?				
b)	Disturb historic resources?				
c)	Disturb paleontological resources?				
d)	Other:				
Setti the a	•	and no paleon	tological resou	urces are know	n to exist in
Impa	act. The proposed amendment does not re	quire any dev	elopment or a	ny site disturba	nce.
_	gation/Conclusion. No significant cultusures are necessary.	ıral resource	impacts will	occur, and no	mitigation
6.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Result in exposure to or production of unstable earth conditions, such as landslides, earthquakes, liquefaction, ground failure, land subsidence or other similar hazards?				

6.	GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b)	Be within a California Geological Survey "Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone"?				
c)	Result in soil erosion, topographic changes, loss of topsoil or unstable soil conditions from project-related improvements, such as vegetation removal, grading, excavation, or fill?				
d)	Change rates of soil absorption, or amount or direction of surface runoff?				
e)	Include structures located on expansive soils?				
f)	Change the drainage patterns where substantial on- or off-site sedimentation/ erosion or flooding may occur?				
g)	Involve activities within the 100-year flood zone?				
h <i>)</i>	Be inconsistent with the goals and policies of the County's Safety Element relating to Geologic and Seismic Hazards?				
i)	Preclude the future extraction of valuable mineral resources?				
j)	Other:				
	ing. Geology – Since the proposed amend ssue of geology is not applicable.	dment will not	result or cause	e development	of any kind,
Impa	act. As proposed, this amendment will not	result in the di	sturbance of a	ny property.	
	gation/Conclusion. No significant geologessary.	gic impacts wil	ll occur, and n	o mitigation me	easures are
7.	HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable

7.	HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Result in a risk of explosion or release of hazardous substances (e.g. oil, pesticides, chemicals, radiation) or exposure of people to hazardous substances?				
b)	Interfere with an emergency response or evacuation plan?				
c)	Expose people to safety risk associated with airport flight pattern?				
d)	Increase fire hazard risk or expose people or structures to high fire hazard conditions?				
e)	Create any other health hazard or potential hazard?				
f)	Other:	_			
proje Impa	ing. The airport area is not located in an ect is not within a high severity risk area for act. The project does not propose the use gnificant fire safety risk. The project is not it	r fire. The proje e of hazardous	ect is within the materials. The	Airport Review project does it	area.
	gation/Conclusion. No significant impaci cipated, and no mitigation measures are ne		of hazards or	hazardous ma	aterials are
8.	NOISE - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Expose people to noise levels that exceed the County Noise Element thresholds?				
b)	Generate increases in the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas?				
c)	Expose people to severe noise or vibration?				
d)	Other:	_ 🗆			

Setting. The proposed amendment does not have any affect on aircraft or airport operations nor does the proposed amendment result in any type of development.

Impact. As proposed the amendment works towards decreasing the impact of noise on the occupants and uses that surround the airport, this is achieved by allowing uses that are compatible and consistent with airport operations and the ALUP.

Mitigation/Conclusion. No significant noise impacts will occur, and no mitigation measures are necessary.

9.	POPULATION/HOUSING - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Induce substantial growth in an area either directly or indirectly (e.g., through projects in an undeveloped area or extension of major infrastructure)?				
b)	Displace existing housing or people, requiring construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				
c)	Create the need for substantial new housing in the area?				
d)	Use substantial amount of fuel or energy?				
e)	Other:				
Inves	ng. In its efforts to provide for affordable stment Partnerships (HOME) Program and ram, which provides limited financing to ty.	nd the Commu	nity Developm	ent Block Gra	nt (CDBG)
-	nct. The proposed amendment will not reing housing.	esult in a need	I for new hous	sing, and will no	ot displace
_	ation/Conclusion. No population and he ecessary.	ousing impacts	will occur, an	d no mitigation	measures
10.	PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES - Will the project have an effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered public services in any of the following areas:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Fire protection?				

10.	PUBLIC SERVICES/UTILITIES - Will the project have an effect upon, or result in the need for new or altered public services in any of the following areas:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b)	Police protection (e.g., Sheriff, CHP)?				
c)	Schools?				
d)	Roads?				
e)	Solid Wastes?				
f)	Other public facilities?				
g)	Other:				
Cal F	ng. The area that surrounds the airport als Fire and the County Sheriff. However, sir opment there are not associated impacts of	ice the propo	sed amendme		•
Impa	ct. No significant project-specific impacts	to utilities or p	ublic services	were identified.	
Mitig are	ation/Conclusion. No public services/u	tilities impacts	will occur, an	•	measures necessary.
11		Potentially	Impact can	Insignificant	
11.	RECREATION - Will the project:	Significant	& will be mitigated	Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities?		& will be		
	Increase the use or demand for parks		& will be		
a)	Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities? Affect the access to trails, parks or		& will be		
a) b) c)	Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities? Affect the access to trails, parks or other recreation opportunities?	Significant	& will be mitigated	Impact	Applicable
a) b) c) Settin	Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities? Affect the access to trails, parks or other recreation opportunities? Other ng. The proposed amendment will not affect.	Significant Control Control	& will be mitigated ark or other rec	Impact Creational resou	Applicable
a) b) c) Settin Impa resou Mitig	Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities? Affect the access to trails, parks or other recreation opportunities? Other ng. The proposed amendment will not affect.	Significant Significant	& will be mitigated ark or other red	Impact Creational resoulitional park or re	Applicable
a) b) c) Settin Impa resou Mitig neces	Increase the use or demand for parks or other recreation opportunities? Affect the access to trails, parks or other recreation opportunities? Other ng. The proposed amendment will not affect. The proposed amendment will not creatinces. ation/Conclusion. No significant recreating	Significant Significant	& will be mitigated ark or other red	Impact Creational resoulitional park or re	Applicable

12.	TRANSPORTATION/ CIRCULATION - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
b)	Reduce existing "Levels of Service" on public roadway(s)?				
c)	Create unsafe conditions on public roadways (e.g., limited access, design features, sight distance, slow vehicles)?				
d)	Provide for adequate emergency access?				
e)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?				
f)	Result in inadequate internal traffic circulation?				
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., pedestrian access, bus turnouts, bicycle racks, etc.)?				
h)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns that may result in substantial safety risks?				
i)	Other:				
	ng. Since the proposed amendment does ed concerns were identified.	not result in	future developr	ment, no signific	cant traffic-
	ct. The proposed amendment will not icant change to the existing road service o			and will not	result in a
_	ation/Conclusion. No significant traffic in ssary.	npacts were ic	dentified, and n	o mitigation me	asures are
13.	WASTEWATER - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Violate waste discharge requirements or Central Coast Basin Plan criteria for wastewater systems?				
b)	Change the quality of surface or ground water (e.g., nitrogen-loading, daylighting)?				
c)	Adversely affect community wastewater service provider?				

13.	WASTEWATER - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
d)	Other:				
	ng. The proposed amendment does no ewater issues.	t result or pro	opose any de	velopment that	will affect
-	ct. The proposed amendment does not py type of development proposed, therefore	•	•	•	ystems nor
_	ation/Conclusion. No wastewater in ssary.	mpacts were	identified, no	mitigation mea	asures are
14.	WATER - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Violate any water quality standards?				
b)	Discharge into surface waters or otherwise alter surface water quality (e.g., turbidity, temperature, dissolved oxygen, etc.)?				
c)	Change the quality of groundwater (e.g., saltwater intrusion, nitrogenloading, etc.)?				
d)	Change the quantity or movement of available surface or ground water?				
e)	Adversely affect community water service provider?				
f)	Other:				
	ng. The proposed amendment does not re availability or quality problems are not app		e of a water so	ource, therefore	the issues
Impa surfa	ct. The proposed amendment does not ce water sources.	result in any o	development s	o there are no	impacts to
	ation/Conclusion. Since no impacts to fic measures above standard requirements				entified, no
15.	LAND USE - Will the project:	Inconsistent	Potentially Inconsistent	Consistent	Not Applicable

15.	LAND USE - Will the project:	Inconsistent	Potentially Inconsistent	Consistent	Not Applicable
a)	Be potentially inconsistent with land use, policy/regulation (e.g., general plan [county land use element and ordinance], local coastal plan, specific plan, Clean Air Plan, etc.) adopted to avoid or mitigate for environmental effects?				
b)	Be potentially inconsistent with any habitat or community conservation plan?				
c)	Be potentially inconsistent with adopted agency environmental plans or policies with jurisdiction over the project?				
d)	Be potentially incompatible with surrounding land uses?				
e)	Other:				
The Airpo Code	equired to conform to the general plans, special conformition of the general plans, special control of the conformition of the	pting the Califort with local places by which such	ornia Aeronautanning instrum- inconsistencie and therefore	tics Act, antic ents, and Pub s are to be res	ipated that blic Utilities solved.
16.	MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Will the project:	Potentially Significant	Impact can & will be mitigated	Insignificant Impact	Not Applicable
a)	Have the potential to degrade the qual substantially reduce the habitat of a fi fish or wildlife population to drop belothereaten to eliminate a plant or animal number or restrict the range of a rare or eliminate important examples of the California history or prehistory?	ish or wildlife so ow self-sustain I community, ro or endangered	species, cause ing levels, educe the I plant or anim		
b)	Have impacts that are individually limiconsiderable? ("Cumulatively considincremental effects of a project are connection with the effects of past procurrent projects, and the effects of	erable" means Insiderable wh	that the en viewed in		

	probable future projects)				
c)	Have environmental effects which wadverse effects on human beings, eindirectly?				
Co En	r further information on CEQA or the cunty's web site at "www.sloplanning.curionmental Resources Evaluation Studelines/" for information about the Califormation	org" under "Environr ystem at: "http	nental Revie ://ceres.ca.go	w", or the	California

Exhibit A - Initial Study References and Agency Contacts

The County Planning or Environmental Division have contacted various agencies for their comments on the proposed project. With respect to the subject application, the following have been contacted (marked with an \boxtimes) and when a response was made, it is either attached or in the application file:

Cont	acted Agency	Response
	County Public Works Department	Not Applicable
	County Environmental Health Division	Not Applicable
	County Agricultural Commissioner's Office	Not Applicable
	County Airport Manager	Not Applicable
	Airport Land Use Commission	Not Applicable
	Air Pollution Control District	Not Applicable
	County Sheriff's Department	Not Applicable
	Regional Water Quality Control Board	Not Applicable
	CA Coastal Commission	Not Applicable
	CA Department of Fish and Game	Not Applicable
	CA Department of Forestry	Not Applicable
	CA Department of Transportation	Not Applicable
	Community Service District	Not Applicable
X	Other <u>CalTrans Div. of Aeronautics</u>	Not Applicable
	Other	Not Applicable
	** "No comment" or "No concerns"-type respons	es are usually not attached
inforr	osed project and are hereby incorporated by remaining and Bu	ilding Department.
Cour	Project File for the Subject Application	Area Plan and Update EIR
	aty documents Airport Land Use Plans	☐ Circulation Study
	Annual Resource Summary Report	Other documents
	Building and Construction Ordinance	Archaeological Resources Map
H	Coastal Policies Framework for Planning (Coastal & Inland)	Area of Critical Concerns MapAreas of Special Biological
	General Plan (Inland & Coastal), including all	Importance Map
_	maps & elements; more pertinent elements	California Natural Species Diversity
	considered include:	Database
	Agriculture & Open Space Element Energy Element	☐ Clean Air Plan☐ Fire Hazard Severity Map
	Environment Plan (Conservation,	Flood Hazard Maps
	Historic and Esthetic Elements)	☐ Natural Resources Conservation
	☐ Housing Element☐ Noise Element	Service Soil Survey for SLO County Regional Transportation Plan
	Parks & Recreation Element	Uniform Fire Code
	Safety Element	Water Quality Control Plan (Central
	Land Use Ordinance	Coast Basin – Region 3)
H	Real Property Division Ordinance Trails Plan	GIS mapping layers (e.g., habitat, streams, contours, etc.)
	Solid Waste Management Plan	Other

In addition, the following project specific information and/or reference materials have been considered as a part of the Initial Study:

Oceano County Airport DRAFT Master Plan

Oceano County ALUP 1976